REMARKS

Claims 1 to 29 are pending. The Examiner's reconsideration of the rejection is respectfully requested.

Claims 1 to 29 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a), as being unpatentable over Porter et al. (U.S. Patent No. 5,889,945) in view of Tahara et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,031,631). The Examiner stated essentially that combined teachings of Porter and Tahara teach or suggest all the limitations of the claimed invention.

It is impermissible for the Examining attorney to use hindsight in choosing citations which, when grouped together, appear to anticipate the application. Multiple cited prior art references must suggest the desirability of being combined, and the references must be viewed without the benefit of hindsight afforded by the disclosure. The Examiner has chosen a multitude of references, apparently in hindsight, to reject claims 1 to 29, however, each reference relates to an entirely different art, for example, Porter teaches video conferencing methods and Tahara teaches methods for controlling a plurality of digital copiers. Given the different fields of the references, and the lack of a suggestion or motivation to combine the references, these references are not believed to be combinable. Even when viewed together, the cited references do not render the Applicant's invention obvious. Therefore, reconsideration of the rejection is respectfully requested.

At least claims 1, 7, 11, 14, 18, 20, and 25 are believed to be allowable for additional reasons.

Claims 1 and 7 claim, *inter alia*, "a window ID allocation section for allocating a window ID for a window constituting a unit for transferring an image signal." Claims 11 and 14 claim, *inter alia*, "recognition means for recognizing a correspondence relation of said

2

panel ID and a window ID to be processed, with respect to the window ID allocated for a window that is a transfer processing unit of the image signal." Claims 18 and 20 claim, *inter alia*, "said host system allocates a window ID for a window in an image space, of which the host system is conscious." Claim 25 claims, *inter alia*, "by a display panel having the panel ID other than '0', selecting one of the plurality of display panels connected to the downstream side, thus transferring the attribute information to said host system."

Referring to claims 1 and 7, Porter teaches a method and apparatus for associating user information with conference participants in a conferencing environment (see col. 2 line 64 to Col. 3 line 8). Porter does not teach or suggest "a window ID allocation section for allocating a window ID for a window constituting a unit for transferring an image signal" as claimed in claims 1 and 7. The windows of Porter are not analogous to the windows constituting a unit for transferring an image signal of claims 1 and 7. The windows of Porter are merely elements of a graphical user interface displayed and controlled by an end point. The windows of the present invention are units for transferring an image signal from a host device to a panel having a corresponding panel ID. Porter does not teach any such unit for transferring an image signal to a panel. Accordingly, Porter fails to teach or suggest all the limitations of claims 1 and 7.

Tahara teaches an image processing system with independent control of image forming apparatus (i.e., printers or digital copiers) (see abstract). Tahara further teaches an imaging processing unit (IPU) for connecting the image forming apparatus to a computer (see col. 25, lines 49 to 51). Tahara does not teach or suggest "a window ID allocation section for allocating a window ID for a window constituting a unit for transferring an image signal" as claimed in claims 1 and 7. Tahara's IPU is an interface between a computer and a plurality

3

of image processing stations. Clearly the IPU is not a "window constituting a unit for transferring said image signal" as claimed in claims 1 and 7. Further, none of the printers, the IPU, or the computer allocates a window ID for a window constituting a unit for transferring an image signal. Therefore, Tahara fails to cure the deficiencies of Porter. Claims 1 and 7 are believed to be allowable over the combined teachings of Porter and Tahara.

Referring now to claims 11 and 14, Porter does not teach or suggest a "recognition means for recognizing a correspondence relation of said panel ID and a window ID to be processed, with respect to the window ID allocated for a window that is a transfer processing unit of the image signal." Porter teaches an end point displays conferencing information (see col. 5, lines 6 to 11). The display of Porter does not have an ID. Porter does not teach or suggest a panel ID or a window ID, much less a "recognition means for recognizing a correspondence relation of said panel ID and a window ID to be processed, with respect to the window ID allocated for a window that is a transfer processing unit of the image signal." Therefore, Porter fails to teach or suggest all the limitations of claims 11 and 14.

Tahara teaches a system and method for printing document on multiple printers, each having an address (see col. 1, lines 64 to 67). Tahara does not teach or suggest a "recognition means for recognizing a correspondence relation of said panel ID and a window ID to be processed, with respect to the window ID allocated for a window that is a transfer processing unit of the image signal" as claimed in claims 11 and 14. The printer addresses of Tahara are not analogous to a panel ID or a window ID. The printer addresses are related to networking a plurality of printers. The printer addresses are not a "recognition

4

means for recognizing a correspondence relation of said panel ID and a window ID to be processed, with respect to the window ID allocated for a window that is a transfer processing unit of the image signal." Therefore, Tahara fails to cure the deficiencies of Porter. The combined teachings of the Porter and Tahara fail to teach or suggest all the limitations of claims 11 and 14.

Referring to claims 18 and 20, Porter does not disclose or suggest "said host system allocates a window ID for a window in an image space, of which the host system is conscious." Porter teaches a system and method for conferencing comprising the exchange of information between end points (see col. 3, lines 37 to 45). Porter does not teach or suggest an image space, much less a window having a window ID in the image space. Porter is not concerned with the display of an image signal, only the exchange of data between end points, wherein each end point controls the characteristics of a display individually. Therefore, Porter fails to teach or suggest all the limitations of claims 18 and 20.

Referring to Tahara and claims 18 and 20; Tahara does not disclose or suggest "said host system allocates a window ID for a window in an image space, of which the host system is conscious." Tahara teaches a system and method for printing document on multiple printers (see col. 1, lines 64 to 67). Tahara does not teach or suggest an image space, much less a window having a window ID in the image space. Tahara is not concerned with the display of an image signal, but methods for outputting the same image simultaneously of a plurality of digital copiers. Therefore, Tahara fails to cure the deficiencies of Porter. The combined teachings of Porter and Tahara fail to teach or suggest all the limitations of claims 18 and 20.

Referring now to claim 25, Porter does not teach or suggest, "reading out attribute information of a specified display panel by said host system." Porter teaches that each end point is responsible for managing its own display of information (col. 5, lines 6 to 11). Thus, no attribute information of an end point is known to other participants in the conference. Porter does not teach or suggest, "reading out attribute information of a specified display panel by said host system." Therefore, Porter fails to teach or suggest all the limitations of claim 25.

Referring to Tahara and claim 25; Tahara does not teach or suggest, "reading out attribute information of a specified display panel by said host system." Tahara teaches a printers and digital copiers. Tahara does not teach or suggest panels, much less, "reading out attribute information of a specified display panel by said host system." Therefore, Tahara fail to cure the deficiencies of Porter. The combined teachings of Porter and Tahara fail to teach or suggest all the limitations of claim 25.

Claims 2 to 6 depend from claim 1. Claims 8 to 10 depend from claim 7. Claims 12 and 13 depend from claim 11. Claims 15 to 17 depend from claim 14. Claim 19 depends from claim 18. Claims 21 to 24 depend from claim 20. Claims 26 to 29 depend from claim 25. The dependent claims are believed to be allowable for at least the reasons given for the independent claims. At least claims 2 and 8 are believed to be allowable for additional reasons.

Referring to claims 2 and 8, the Examiner stated that Porter teaches a signal generation device, which may be, coupled with system I/O bus 331 along with other elements including display device (323).

Claims 2 and 8 claim a control signal section that "outputs setting information of a processing space that is information relating to a display area to be processed for each unit having said panel ID."

6

Porter teaches a system and method for conferencing comprising the exchange of information between end points, wherein the end points control display functions (see col. 5, lines 6 to 11). Porter does not teach or suggest a "unit having said panel ID", wherein a unit is a single panel or a predetermined number of panels for displaying a portion of the image space, essentially as claimed in claims 2 and 8. Porter teaches that an end point has a display device on a bus (see Fig. 3). Porter does not teach or suggest that the display device has a panel ID, essentially as claimed in claims 2 and 8 of the present invention. Therefore, Porter fails to teach or suggest all the limitations of claim 2 and 8.

Tahara teaches a plurality of image forming apparatus each having an address. Tahara does not teach or suggest a "unit having said panel ID", wherein a unit is a single panel or a predetermined number of panels for displaying a portion of the image space, essentially as claimed in claims 2 and 8. An image forming apparatus, i.e., a printer or digital copier is not a unit, much less a unit having a panel ID, wherein a unit is a single panel or a predetermined number of panels for displaying a portion of the image space, essentially as claimed in claims 2 and 8. Therefore, Tahara fail to cure the deficiencies of Porter. The combined teachings of Porter and Tahara fail to teach or suggest all the limitations of claims 2 and 8.

Accordingly, the Examiner's reconsideration of the rejection is respectfully requested.

For the forgoing reasons, the application, including claims 1 to 29 is believed to be in condition for allowance. Early and favorable reconsideration of the case is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,

By: _____

Nathaniel T. Wallace
Reg. No. 48,909
Attorney for Applicant(s)

Mailing Address:
F. Chau & Associates, LLP
1900 Hempstead Turnpike
Suite 501
East Meadow, NY 11554